

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending and have been examined in the present application.

Initially, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority to Japanese Patent application No. 2003-364962, and receipt of the certified copy of the priority application in this application from the International Bureau.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 6 and 7, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 14, 15 and 18-20. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that each of claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16 and 17 are also allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-13, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3, 646,481 to Den. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a waveguide conversion device that includes "an unnecessary-wave suppression groove provided in a mode conversion part between the rectangular waveguide and the circular waveguide." Because the unnecessary-wave suppression groove is provided in the mode conversion part between the rectangular waveguide and the circular waveguide, an unnecessary transmission mode is prevented from being excited in the circular waveguide when signals are transmitted between the waveguides.

Den does not teach or suggest an unnecessary-wave suppression groove as required by independent claim 1. The waveguide transducer of Den uses a plunger 34 that is adjusted to obtain a maximum electric field in the plane of the coupling ports 18 and 20. The plunger 34 of Den, however, does not and can not operate as an unnecessary-wave suppression groove because it is not provided in a mode conversion part between the rectangular waveguide and the circular waveguide as required by independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8-13, 16 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims includes additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 5, 8-13, 16 and 17 are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and allowance of the present application with claims 1-20 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: August 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Richard LaCava/  
Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant